

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 94 11:01:13 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #624
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sat, 4 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 624

Today's Topics:

 "73's"
 440 in So. Cal. (6 msgs)
 ARLB049 FCC clarifies action
 ARLP022 Propagation de KT7H
 favor please
 Ham license plates in WA
 Ham Radio few problem (3 msgs)
 Operating in Mexico

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 Jun 1994 06:32:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!
newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!unlinfo.unl.edu!
mcduffie@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "73's"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

ray.wade@michaelr.com (RAY WADE) writes:

>WRONG! 73 means "Best Regards". 73's obviously therefore must mean
>"Best Regard(es)", neither of which was or is intended to be used

Wow! This guy is really going to be embarrassed when he figures out
what he said.

Can you say a_pos_tro_phe ?????

Gary

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 14:10:07 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: jaminge@pb2esac.com (John Minger) writes:

: > We were told in rather curt terms that no-code techs were not welcome
: > there. (Something about not being able to copy the repeater's ID..)

: Well, I can sympathize with their attitude. Many no-clue technicians in
: this area are simply CB operators extending their available channel
: selections. Perhaps the same is true in your area, I can't say.

It isn't the case in Southern California. And I think that your use of
derogatory terms such as "no-clue technicians" to describe a whole class
of operators is reprehensible, especially in a public forum. The new
Techs in our area are mainly FB ops, many of whom are actively engaged in
upgrading to General thru Extra.

Calling these guys names is not in the spirit of ham radio. Welcoming
them into the hobby and elmering them *is*.

--

rogjd@netcom.com
Glendale, CA
AB6WR

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 13:59:37 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

: > Agreed, the closed repeater owners would have the same rights as the rest

: > of us. They simply wouldn't have rights over and above the rest of us,
: > namely, coordination for a repeater pair on a closed or private basis.

: Refusing a repeater coordination on the basis of its "open" or "closed"
: status could be considered illegal, as the FCC recognizes "closed" repeaters
: as being completely valid. By saying that a "closed" repeater will not be
: granted coordination you are not giving all repeater owners the same
: rights, you are discriminating against closed repeater owners.

No it couldn't. That does not meet the legal test of discrimination,
namely, adverse action against a protected class. You're wrong.

: > Once 440 reached the level of openness found on the model band, 2 meters,
: > perhaps this could be relaxed.

: Why should this be a goal to achieve? Simply because 144/440mhz radios
: are inexpensive today? If 440mhz doesn't present the level of "openness"
: you like, then why not move up to 1.2ghz?

Because like 40,000 other hams in Southern California, I've got a dual
band 440/2m radio.

: > The current 440 coordination group has abused its authority recklessly.
: > This can be seen quite clearly by the disuse into which Southern Cal's
: > 440 band has degenerated.

: The only evidence I have seen related to band mismanagement posted here
: by those who seek to eliminate closed repeaters from 440mhz are "paper"
: repeaters being maintained by the coordinating body. And, while I agree
: that this is improper, there are ways to deal with it above and beyond
: eliminating closed systems on 440mhz.

If you don't consider the relative non-utilization of an entire choice
band, 440, prima facie evidence of bad management and coordination, well,
OK. I and others do.

: > True, but the ones in Southern Cal are happy with the paper radios. If
: > not, then why are they coordinated?

: The easiest way to deal with paper coordinations is to document no activity
: on a particular frequency for a month, and when you hear nothing, quietly
: place an open system on that frequency.

Not a bad idea, actually.

--

rogjd@netcom.com
Glendale, CA

AB6WR

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 14:05:17 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:
: rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

: > What is objectionable is that the coordinating body reserves the
: > repeater pairs for a small group, thereby discouraging other potential
: > repeater trustees from opening OPEN repeaters on 440.

: Again, your bias shows. If your statement had been:

Yep, my bias shows. I like OPEN repeaters. I admit it. But let's get
away from demagogic terms (which you are using) like "bias." What's
wrong with the word "preference" ? It is a much better and more accurate
rendition of my meaning. Your use of the word "bias" connotes some sort
of unjust discrimination. This is not appropriate.

: What is objectionable is that the coordinating body reserves the repeater
: pairs for a small group, thereby discouraging other potential repeater
: trustees from establishing repeaters on 440.

: Then I would agree completely with you. Anyone who wants to set up a
: repeater, regardless of its status, should not be denied such because
: the coordinating body is reserving frequency pairs for their friends.

: > To validate my point, all one needs to do is contrast 2 meters to 440 in
: > Southern California. Two meters is bursting with vitality! Many many
: > open repeaters with good operating procedures and courtesy, AND LOTS OF
: > FRIENDLY QSOS as the order of the day. 440? Mostly dead silence. The
: > few open repeaters are very active; so much in fact that it difficult to
: > get time on them.

: The same is true of this area. But, of the 3000+ hams in RI, what
: percentage do you think have dual-band radios? Most new hams purchase
: a 2 meter radio by default, and don't even get on 440mhz until they
: have "discovered" the band, usually through the help of a friend who
: has a dual-band radio.

That's a hoot! 3000+ hams! We have more than that within a radius of

three miles of my QTH! In fact, we have somewhere on the order of 50,000 hams within simplex range of my QTH. Perhaps you simply don't understand the issues here in Southern California.

: > 440 in Southern California needs a new coordinating body and a new
: > coordinating philosophy, it's as simple as that. I propose the following
: > as a starter: "If you aren't open, you aren't coordinated."

: I'll agree with your first statement, but not your second.

: MD

: --

: -- Michael P. Deignan

: -- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101

: -- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

--

rogjd@netcom.com

Glendale, CA

AB6WR

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 17:19:45 GMT

From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net

Subject: 440 in So. Cal.

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> And I think that your use of
> derogatory terms such as "no-clue technicians" to describe a whole class
> of operators is reprehensible, especially in a public forum. The new
> Techs in our area are mainly FB ops, many of whom are actively engaged in
> upgrading to General thru Extra.

I believe the term "no clue" applies to dozens of CB transplants that infiltrate the hobby, and lend credence to despicable activities like jamming that the hobby would have unanimously denounced years ago.

You conveniently edited out the portion of my message where I indicated that no-code techs comprise the largest license class of operator on my "closed" machine.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 16:59:15 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> Yep, my bias shows. I like OPEN repeaters. I admit it. But let's get
> away from demagogic terms (which you are using) like "bias." What's
> wrong with the word "preference" ? It is a much better and more accurate
> rendition of my meaning. Your use of the word "bias" connotes some sort
> of unjust discrimination. This is not appropriate.

You are discriminating. The term bias applies. Regardless of whether or
not you like OPEN repeaters, the FCC has said that closed repeaters are
perfectly legal.

> That's a hoot! 3000+ hams! We have more than that within a radius of
> three miles of my QTH! In fact, we have somewhere on the order of 50,000
> hams within simplex range of my QTH. Perhaps you simply don't understand
> the issues here in Southern California.

Oh, I understand perfectly. You want something for nothing. Gimme, gimme,
gimme "OPEN" repeaters so I can yak all day and not have to pay anything.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 16:53:26 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> No it couldn't. That does not meet the legal test of discrimination,
> namely, adverse action against a protected class. You're wrong.

The FCC recognizes all repeaters are "closed". If you attempt to allot frequency coordinations on the basis of the trustee's willingness to allow operators to utilize the machine at that frequency, you had best be ready to defend your position financially.

> Because like 40,000 other hams in Southern California, I've got a dual
> band 440/2m radio.

Because like thousands of other hams throughout the US, I've got a general coverage receiver/transmitter. Guess that means I should be able to transmit everywhere.

> If you don't consider the relative non-utilization of an entire choice
> band, 440, prima facie evidence of bad management and coordination, well,
> OK. I and others do.

I don't arbitrarily assign "utilization" as the criteria by which repeaters should be coordinated. There are numerous repeaters in this area which receive less utilization than my closed machine. Using your criteria, we should decoordinate those "open" repeaters.

Since high utilization of an open repeater generally implies excellent coverage, it also implies high site, high power, and expensive equipment.

Sounds like you want a free ride at everyelses expense.

: The easiest way to deal with paper coordinations is to document no activity
: on a particular frequency for a month, and when you hear nothing, quietly
: place an open system on that frequency.

> Not a bad idea, actually.

Its how "renegade" repeaters get 'coordinated' around here. Its difficult to argue with facts. And, the fact is if you can document no activity on a frequency for a prolonged period of time, and you set a machine up on that frequency, the odds dramatically shift in your favor that if the coordinating body does complain, you have the evidence to support your position that you were there first.

Its worked for several systems in this area.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Fri, 03 Jun 1994 22:14:24 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARLB049 FCC clarifies action
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SB QST @ ARL \$ARLB049
ARLB049 FCC clarifies action

ZCZC AG14
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 49 ARLB049

Date: Fri, 03 Jun 1994 22:15:19 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARLP022 Propagation de KT7H
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SB PROP @ ARL \$ARLP022
ARLP022 Propagation de KT7H

ZCZC AP36
QST de W1AW
Propagation Forecast Bulletin 22 ARLP022

Date: Fri, 03 Jun 94 05:38:27 MST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!asuvax!ennews!wierius!isus!dtr!
jamoran@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: favor please
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

can I ask a favor of someone. Please help me get messages in the
Scanner/Shortwave newsgroup. My local BBS that gives me Usenet access
does not carry either of these newsgroups.

and second.. is there anyone who has frequency infor they want to share
or exchange. I don't know which I'll do first, get my ham ticket or
get my wings (pilots license) JOHN /PHX

--

jamoran@dtr.stat.com (John moran)
Data Terminal Ready BBS +1 602 993 4753

Date: 4 Jun 1994 07:18:29 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
caen!malgudi.oar.net!news.ans.net!sitka.wsipc.wednet.edu!connected.com!
connected.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham license plates in WA
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

As best as I can recall the initial cost is \$8.00, no additional costs
each year. But you have to write the Amateur radio desk at the state
office in Olympia

Ralph Lindberg N7BSN	More hobbies than time
Ellen Winnie N7PYK	Just because I'm not doing anything
email => dragonsl@connected.com	doesn't mean I have nothing to do.
Members SCA, REI, ARRL, AMSAT, PS Lacemakers, NW Microwave, KCFMS, CS-VHF,	
Good Sams, RPI and Kitsap ARES	

Date: 4 Jun 94 13:13:39 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Brad Ward (Brad.Ward@f2711.n206.z1.fidonet.org) wrote:

: JETI> Most recently the FCC has affirmed that the repeater operator has the
: JETI> right to say who uses the repeater. If you jammers are such jerks
: that
: JETI> the operator doesn't want you using his machine, he can boot you off
: JETI> even an _open_ repeater.

: If the control operator has the right to boot anybody off an open
: repeater, what's the point of having a closed machine?

: ... Catch the Blue Wave!

The default changes. On an open machine, you can use it until you're
told not to. On a closed machine, you can't use it until you're given
permission. Other than that, there's no difference.

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 13:51:29 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

RAY WADE (ray.wade@michaelr.com) wrote:
: On 05-28-94 ROGER BUFFINGTON wrote to ALL...

SNIP

: Did it ever occur to you that the "few good old boys" may own the
: thing? I am unaware of ANY repeater ANYWHERE that is owned by the
: public. And here is another flash, if I own something, it's MINE
: TO DO AS I DAMN WELL PLEASE WITH IT. If you want to join my "club"
: pay dues, and help maintain it, I might allow you to be "a good old
: boy". Parasites (dead beats) are not welcome!

Listen, Bub, you might try reading the thread before making comments like
your last article. First of all, you attribute some of Roger Bly's
comments to me, which I don't appreciate one little bit. Let's get it
together.

It's obvious that you have either not read, or were unable to comprehend
the issues in this thread. Everyone here knows that repeaters are not
public property. It has been mentioned by myself and others on this
thread that we agree with the concept of a repeater owner expecting some
kind of support in return for providing the repeater.

Next time how about reading and thinking before writing, hey?

73

: * OFFLINE 1.56 * You only THINK I'm devious? Actually, I'm far more twisted.
: .
--

rogjd@netcom.com
Glendale, CA
AB6WR

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 17:23:06 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> It has been mentioned by myself and others on this
> thread that we agree with the concept of a repeater owner expecting some
> kind of support in return for providing the repeater.

Really? What if the repeater owner wishes to restrict access so that those who choose to support the repeater have a place to go when they can't find an open spot elsewhere? What if the owner's concept of support means you help pay part of the bills associated with upkeep of the repeater, otherwise you can't use the repeater?

The impression I've gotten is that you reject both of these concepts. That, to me, indicates you want a free ride at other people's expense.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Daignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: 4 Jun 94 17:41:01 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!
atlas.tntech.edu!jmg@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Operating in Mexico
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone know if you need to get a license or do paperwork to operate in Mexico?

thanks

Jeff, AC4HF

Date: (null)
From: (null)
SB PROP ARL ARLP022
ARLP022 Propagation de KT7H

Solar activity was down again last week. From May 27 through June 1 there were no visible Sunspots, and to make matters worse, there were several days of disturbed and stormy conditions due to a recurring coronal hole. The worst day was May 30 when the Boulder A index was 35.

Conditions will remain unstable until the middle of the month. Solar flux should gradually rise, but only peak around 85 before mid June. Around June 25 or 26 disturbed conditions should return.

Sunspot Numbers from May 26 through June 1 were 11, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0 and 0, with a mean of 1.6. 10.7 cm flux was 71.5, 70.2, 70.2, 69.5, 69.4, 69.1 and 67.6, with mean of 69.6.

The path projection for this week is from San Francisco, California to Cambodia.

80 meters may be open briefly around 1145 to 1245z, and 40 meters from 1130 to 1330. Check 30 meters from 1030 to 1430. 20 meters may be open around 0830 to 0945 and from 1400 to 1700. 17 meters and above do not look promising at this time.

NNNN

/EX

Date: Sat, 4 Jun 1994 14:17:47 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!rogjd@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2snjlc\$72p@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <gregCqu5LJ.62G@netcom.com>, <2so48a\$gl@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Jim Reese (jreese@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:

: Ahh! We FINALLY get to the REAL root of this discussion...you're right and
: we're wrong...

: Who died and made you God?

Oh, come on Jim, his was a well-written summary of the issue, namely, one group feels one way about an issue, and the other group feels the other way. Both groups understand the point of view of the other.

Comments like "Who died and made you God?" are not helpful.

: --
: Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans don't let the truth get in
: jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | the way of a good story."
: --

rogjd@netcom.com
Glendale, CA
AB6WR

Date: (null)
From: (null)
SB QST ARL ARLB049
ARLB049 FCC clarifies action

FCC clarifies action

In response to a request from the ARRL and inquiries from others, the FCC's Private Radio Bureau has clarified new rules that went into effect on June 1, 1994. The new rules do not remove the restriction against automatic control of digital and RTTY transmitting below 50 MHz.

The new rules, resulting from action in PR Docket 93-85, relax the Amateur Service rules regarding the responsibility for the content of messages on high-speed digital networks. The Commission amended Section 97.109(e), to allow a forwarding station in a message forwarding system to be automatically controlled while transmitting third party communications.

But, the Commission pointed out in a June 2 statement, Section 97.109(d), which was not amended, still limits automatic control of stations transmitting RTTY or digital emissions to frequencies above 50 MHz.

The FCC currently has under consideration two petitions for rule making, RM-8218 and RM-8280, that address this subject. The petitions were submitted by the ARRL and by the American Digital Radio Society.

More information is in June 1994 QST, page 81.

NNNN

/EX

Date: Sat, 04 Jun 1994 02:56:55 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!gumby!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!witch!doghouse!
jsalemi@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994May30.134341.23782@uxmail.ust.hk>,
<jkauffmnCqMJ6I.K1o@netcom.com><1994May31.025939.28917@uxmail.ust.hk>,
<236@doghouse.win.net><1994Jun3.050511.16933@uxmail.ust.hk>≥°
Reply-To : jsalemi@doghouse.win.net (Joe Salemi)
Subject : Re: Six meter HT

In article <1994Jun3.050511.16933@uxmail.ust.hk>, Michael Lo
(ee_hflo@dma039.ust.hk) writes:

> Please give me some suggestion about purchase 6 meter equipment.
>
> How about 6 meter moible ?
>

I know Yaesu makes one, but I think that's it right now. Not up on the
6m stuff though, so hopefully someone else here can provide you with
more info.

73...joe

Joe Salemi, KR4CZ Internet: jsalemi@doghouse.win.net
Compuserve: 72631,23 FidoNet: 1:109/136 MCI Mail: 433-3961

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #624
